

NOTES OF THE  
MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS  
PLANNERS STAKEHOLDERS GROUP

Friday, April 26, 2002  
MAG Office Building, Suite 200 Saguaro Room  
302 North First Avenue, Phoenix

MEMBERS PRESENT

Wahid Alam, Mesa  
Michael Cartsonis, Litchfield Park  
Ian Cordwell, Cave Creek  
Mark Fooks, Youngtown  
Don Hadder, Sr., Scottsdale  
Kristen Keener, DOC

Joy Mee, Phoenix  
Ron Short, Glendale  
Andy Smith, ADOT  
Jerry Swanson, Gilbert  
Phil Testa, Surprise

OTHERS PRESENT

Michelle Green, MAG

Jack Tomasik, MAG

1. Trust for Public Land

Maria Baier, Conservation Finance Director, of the Trust for Public Land in Arizona presented. Stating that the Trust for Public Land is a land conservation organization our mission statement is as follows:

“The Trust for Public Land conserves land for people to improve the quality of life in our communities and to protect our natural and historic resources for future generations.”

The Trust is project oriented and will provide assistance with acquisition transactions for communities. The Trust has been in business for 30 years and has 38 offices across the United States with approximately 400 employees. The first office was opened in San Francisco and this remains the head office for the organization. The office in Arizona was recently opened and its purpose is to provide assistance to as many projects as possible to demonstrate a need for the Trust services here.

We are a very efficient organization that works on a team approach. Although the Arizona office consists of only one staff member, because of the team approach to projects the resources of the organization from across the country are available and brought together to work on a project as necessary.

The Trust is a 501 (c) 3 organization so there are tax benefits that landowners can derive from selling land to the Trust. The trust actively participates in acquiring land (at a discount, typically 20%) for preservation purposes and then the community will purchase the land from the trust. Approximately 60% of the funding for the Trust comes from land transactions with the remaining 40% coming from grants, and other funding.

The Trust has completed 19 projects over the last 20 years in Arizona. The Trust engages in transactions that amount to approximately \$460 million dollars a year.

We work on projects based on a request for a community. The Trust will look at a project and assess its feasibility, and provide advice and assistance if possible.

The Trust also has a Conservation Finance Program which, at the request will assist communities in feasibility research, polling, drafting ballot language and campaign work that leads to the creation of a funding source for open space acquisition. This program is free, but the Trust for Public Land must be invited to participate in a project by elected officials

#### *Questions/comments*

*What about State Trust Lands and the economic value that open space adds to their lands?*

We need a change to the current constitution for this to happen but I think that things are changing and in a positive way. The Trust is open to a variety of concepts that might work. We try to be broad in our thinking.

The Trust also does lobbying for federal legislation to support open space acquisitions.

## 2. Update Ed Fox Process and Regional Governance

### **Ed Fox Group – State Land Department Reform Discussions**

The Ed Fox Group has not met since our last meeting. The next meeting of the group will be on April 29, 2002. We will keep you posted.

### **Regional Governance**

#### **Background**

At the February Regional Council meeting, the consensus of the Council was to have the Management Committee make recommendations on the MAG Governance Task Force Recommendations. On March 6, 2002, the Management Committee approved the formation of a subcommittee to examine the functions of an expanded Regional Council Executive Committee, the composition of the

Committee and voting options for the Regional Council. A roster of the Subcommittee members is enclosed (Attachment One).

On March 22, 2002, the Subcommittee met. It was noted at the beginning of the meeting that Bill Pupo from the City of Surprise would not be able to attend the meeting. Mike Hutchinson and Frank Fairbanks mentioned that they had time constraints that may require them to leave the meeting.

The members of the Subcommittee discussed the potential functions for the Regional Council, Executive Committee and the Transportation Policy Committee. It was expressed that the functions of the Executive Committee should be ministerial and that the Regional Council would retain policy decisions. The Subcommittee recommended that the Executive Committee be increased to seven members, with the two new at-large members being nominated and placed on a slate that is voted on by the Regional Council. The Subcommittee also discussed options to the current weighted voting system and the consensus of those present at the time was to not change the voting system.

#### **Functions of the Executive Committee**

The members of the Subcommittee reviewed information that had previously been discussed by the Governance Task Force relating to the functions of the expanded Executive Committee. In reviewing this information, it was mentioned that at one of the Governance Task Force meetings, it had been expressed that the focus of the Executive Committee would be day-to day-business. The Transportation Policy Committee would be the body making transportation recommendations and the Regional Council would be the policy making body. It was stated that the intent of this division of responsibilities would be to have more focused Regional Council meetings by having more routine business handled by the Executive Committee. Based on this premise, the Subcommittee discussed the functions of the Regional Council, Executive Committee and the Transportation Policy Committee and assigned functions to these committees. These functions are displayed in Attachment Two.

#### **Composition of the Executive Committee**

The Subcommittee discussed the proposal to expand the Executive Committee to 9 or 11 members. The proposed Executive Committee included having designated seats for the City of Phoenix, Maricopa County and ADOT. It was expressed at the Subcommittee meeting that if the function of the Executive Committee was primarily ministerial routine business (approving contracts, etc.), that it may be more appropriate to have designated seats on the Transportation Policy Committee. The Subcommittee recommended expanding the current Executive Committee from five to seven members, with the two additional members being at-large seats, nominated and placed on a slate, to be voted on by the Regional Council.

### **Regional Council Voting Options**

Some indicated that one of the original goals was to restructure the transportation process and it may be advantageous to proceed with the formation of the Transportation Policy Committee and deal with voting by the Regional Council at a later date. It was expressed by one of the members that keeping the current voting system may be disadvantageous to larger cities with greater needs and a disproportionate number of lower income residents. Due to the difficulty in achieving a new voting procedure, some expressed it may be advantageous to take the issue off of the table. Others expressed concern with the proposed new weighted voting system and questioned if using a weighted voting system would have changed any of the previous votes taken by MAG. Others questioned that the current weighted voting system served only as a blocking mechanism and was a disadvantage in moving issues forward. Due to previous commitments, the Cities of Mesa and Phoenix excused themselves from the meeting. The consensus of the remaining Subcommittee members present was to not change the voting structure for the Regional Council.

### **Transportation Policy Committee**

At the Subcommittee meeting, it was expressed at the meeting that we should proceed immediately with expanding the membership of the Transportation Policy Committee (TPC). The possible composition was discussed. It was mentioned that the Policy Committee should potentially include representatives from the City of Phoenix, the Arizona Department of Transportation and Maricopa County. Other potential members were discussed, including business leaders, citizens, transit representatives, Native American Communities, social service and environmental representatives. Following the Subcommittee meeting, the draft composition of the TPC that was presented in the MAG Governance Task Force Process was discussed in two separate meetings by the Intergovernmental Representatives. A consensus was reached on a potential composition of the TPC and some general concepts for operation. This was forwarded to the Management Committee for consideration.

The Management Committee recommended the functions of the TPC and endorsed the concept of: (1) reconstituting and expanding the Regional Council Transportation Subcommittee into the Transportation Policy Committee; (2) that a majority of the members of the TPC be Regional Council members; (3) other public and private sector representatives be on the TPC; (4) the Regional Council would appoint the members of the TPC and (5) the TPC would make recommendations to the Regional Council on transportation plans and programs.

The Management Committee also recommended that the Regional Council discuss, deliberate and provide guidance regarding replacing the existing Transportation Subcommittee with an expanded TPC. General issues identified at the Management Committee that may need further deliberation include further expansion of the Policy Committee to include social service and environmental representatives. Also, how to represent transit on the Committee and the

methodology for appointing the business representatives on the Committee. If the Regional Council so desires, the Management Committee offered to provide detail on how to make the process work. These recommendations, the potential composition, and general issues regarding the TPC will be further discussed by the Regional Council Transportation Subcommittee at their meeting on April 17, 2002. A report from the Regional Council Transportation Subcommittee will be provided to the Regional Council.

These recommendations are being forwarded for discussion and action by the Regional Council.

### **3. Regional Development Mission Statement Task Force**

Jack Tomasik presented stating that the existing Regional Development Mission Statement Task Force members have all agreed to participate in an expanded Task Force on the mission of the Planners Stakeholders Group. MAG's desire is to add at least two more planning directors of other member agencies. There is not too much effort involved – much of the work can be accomplished through group emails, with a single face-to-face meeting for selective alternative(s) to present to the full PSG on May 31, 2002.

Note: At the conclusion of the discussion, four individuals volunteered to participate in the Task Force. The complete roster includes:

James Carpentier, Planning Manager, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community

Ian Cordwell, Planning Director, Cave Creek

Don Hadder, Planning Director, Scottsdale

Diana Kaminski, Senior Planner, Tempe

Joy Mee, Assistant Planning Director, Phoenix

Andy Smith, ADOT

Phil Testa, Community Development Director, Surprise

#### Review of Regional Development Mission Statement

The final Regional Development Mission Statement was distributed, and comments were solicited.

#### **MISSION STATEMENT**

**MARICOPA ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTS**

**REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT DIVISION**

**Facilitate collaborative regional planning with Maricopa Association of Governments member agencies, appropriate regional, state, and federal agencies, tribal governments, and the private sector resulting in a high quality of life for the citizens of the region.**

**The Regional Development Division will accomplish this mission through:**

- **Providing the best and most complete information about the physical development of the metropolitan area.**
- **Identifying trends, issues, and patterns regarding the physical make-up of the region.**
- **Providing principles of a regional perspective on the physical nature of the region to educate other agencies and the public.**
- **Facilitating information sharing, coordination of research, and joint planning that relates to common planning issues of member agencies.**

*Question/Comments*

*Consider adding another statement about projects that span municipal boundaries and have wider regional impact?*

The Regional Governance Task Force recommendations on compiling significant regional projects would address this concern. As the RGTF recommendations are being considered and finalized by MAG Regional Council, it is not appropriate for these to appear in the RD Mission Statement for FY2003.

It is anticipated that the PSG would review the RD Mission Statement each year. In future years, MAG RD staff will involve the PSG in developing the RD Work Program.

#### **4. Planners Stakeholders Group Mission Statement**

The central question is: How does the planners stakeholders group go about our business? Who are we?

*Question/Comments*

Q: It would be best to have a summary of the regional development work program for FY03 as a starting point. We should have a summary that can be read in a reasonable amount of time.

A: After some discussion, the following was agreed:

- MAG will prepare this and transmit by e-mail
- Format: 2 page summary; one page of major accomplishments; one page of what going to do in FY03
- For PSG, Management Committee, and Regional Council
- Organize according to mission statement – will show follow-through of new Mission Statement

*Two Most Relevant Mission Statement Items for PSG*

- 1. Identifying trends, issues, and patterns regarding the physical make-up of the region.**
- 2. Facilitating information sharing, coordination of research, and joint planning that relates to common planning issues of member agencies.**

MAG shares regional trends, issues and patterns with community planners in the PSG. We look forward 5-10-20 years out to avoid problems, try to prevent bad things from happening, and do good things.

In a way, planners are prophets. MAG identifies regional trends, issues, and patterns and then asks member agencies, “What are we doing about it?” Communities identify a community problem and a solution to it.

After we identify a regional problem, is there something we can do about it? We can also bring forward issues to Management Committee and Regional Council. Based on Division Mission statement 1 and 2, we can develop a work program or mission for us.

*2040 Transportation Plan – Desire for Planners to Become Involved*

2040 RTP – concerned it will not get adequate attention from planners

In the valley, our historical experience is that transportation planning is done first, and then land use planning follows.

We need to shape land use to make transportation work.

The planning needs to be the other way around – land use first, and then connect with transportation

Major concern that transportation and land use planning will not work if they are done independently

The PSG should be a sounding board for the RTP before corridors are defined. We can give feedback early on.

The discussion concluded with a request that an update on the RTP status should be made to the PSG.

*RTP – Need for Holistic View of Region*

We have been planning for the way people used to behave, rather than how they will behave in 40 years.

The RTP should be an integration of all studies into a holistic view of the region.

What we are lacking is an integrated and holistic view of the region. The RTP should be the integration of all studies into that holistic view.

Need goal and vision of RTP – goals that the plan is designed to carry out

Need quality of life aspect

RD/PSG can't be too encompassing or lose focus. Should identify issues – ask people experienced in this to narrow it down to specific issues

Have to work product on issue.

Learning from other planning agencies is an important part of the PSG meetings. Regional patterns would quickly lose my interest. I want to learn specifics, and how to implement them.

For example, now that many agencies have completed their general plan updates, what are various communities doing to implement their plans. This would be interesting: can we cooperate on that?

The discussion concluded with a request for an a presentation on trends and patterns in the region for to the PSG

#### *Grand Avenue Discussion*

With rapid transit planning, at least 6 communities will be tied together.

Why not a vision for Grand -- why should it only be six lanes for traffic?

Grand Avenue used to be a signature entrance to metro Phoenix

When done with improvements, it could be same signature entrance, only with six lanes. It should be a street of entrance to Phoenix area – have rapid transit

Rapid line is equivalent to 10 lanes of freeway

Route could begin at Wickenburg through Mesa, creating a spine that's lacking

Divert rail traffic along Grand

#### *Luke AFB*

Loud noise zone – Luke AFB – create industrial/job zone

Affects Westside municipalities

Put together in larger picture

#### *Sub-Regional Planning?*

Have PSG meetings on sub-regional level?

No, need to get away from looking at smaller sub-regions – need to see entire regional picture

#### *Planners Stakeholders Group within MAG*

What is PSG allowed to do? What do we have authority to do?

What we find out here, and then go to Management Committee and Regional Council can be important

We need to say: Is this a problem all want to solve?

If we all want to solve it, we pass along upwards, they will work on solving it

We don't want to be a threat

We can understand what people want to have fixed

Let the right people know about these problems

#### *Sharing Ideas*

Share ideas/double check common work

Open space plan – check to see if mesh with general plan

Identify specific open space areas that could be focal point of implementation

Pinal county impact – need handle on the impact on us

What is happening to close-in open space?



*Sharing More Important than Regional Issues*

Concern – Only effective way to implement is to share

Listen and sharing info more important than solving issues

Cities not have capacity to solve all issues

*Availability of Member Agency Planners for Planners Stakeholders Group*

What are we planners going to do after general plans are done?

*Additional TF Members*

Propose take time to do this right

Voluntary TF – communicate, comment, back to larger group

Joy Mee, Assistant Planning Director, Phoenix

Wahid Alam, Planner, Mesa

Ian Cordwell, Planning Director, Cave Creek

Phil Testa Community Development Director, Surprise

all volunteered Phil

5. Heat Island Presentation

6. Paul Hollar presented information with respect to heat islands and what cities can do to help alleviate the problem. The information he presented as well as other documents relating to the issue will be available for review at the MAG office Library.

6. Next Meeting

The next Planners Stakeholders Group meeting will be held on May 31, 2002 at 1:30 pm.